



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,365	08/28/2003	Guangwen Wei	#792-A-PCT-US	7677

7590

04/29/2005

Albert Wai-Kit Chan  
Law Offices of Albert Wai-Kit Chan, LLC  
World Plaza, Suite 604  
141-07 20th Avenue  
Whitestone, NY 11357

EXAMINER

GALVEZ, JAMES JASON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/650,365

Applicant(s)

WEI ET AL.

Examiner

J. Jason Galvez

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-16, 23-25, 27 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-16, 23-25, 27 and 28 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- 5           1.       Claims 1-9, 11, and 23-24, drawn to a recombinant "super-compound" interferon and compositions comprising said "super-compound" interferon, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
2.       Claims 12-16, drawn to polynucleotides, vectors, host cells, and a method of making a recombinant "super-compound" interferon, classified in class  
10           536, subclass 23.1 and classified in class 435, subclasses 325/30.1/69.1.
3.       Claims 25 and 27-28, drawn to methods for preventing or treating viral diseases, said methods comprising administering a "super-compound" interferon, classified in class 424, subclass 85.4.
4.       Claims 25 and 27-28, drawn to methods for preventing or treating tumors,  
15           said methods comprising administering a "super-compound" interferon, classified in class 424, subclass 85.4.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

          Inventions of groups 1 (polypeptides) and 2 (polynucleotides) are distinct from  
20       one another because polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct molecules than polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids; any relationship between a polynucleotide and a polypeptide is dependent

upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In addition, polypeptides can be made by another materially different process than from recombinant polynucleotide expression, such as chemical synthesis or

5 isolation/purification from natural sources.

Furthermore, searching inventions 1 and 2 together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polynucleotides and polypeptides are not coextensive. Inventions 1 and 2 have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Polynucleotide and polypeptide sequences are searched  
10 separately in appropriate databases. There is also a search burden in regards to non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides that would not have described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers that expressed no knowledge of a polypeptide but spoke of its corresponding  
15 gene. Therefore, searches for the inventions are is not coextensive.

Inventions 1 and 3/4 are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different  
20 process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process, such as the production of antibodies.

In addition, inventions 1 and 3/4 have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Moreover, in the instant case, the search for the products of invention 1 and a method of using said products, inventions 3 and 4, are not coextensive. Inventions of group 1 and 3/4 are separate and distinct by way of their different classification and divergent subject matter. Therefore, searching the inventions of groups 1 and 3 or 4 together would impose a serious burden on the Examiner and USPTO resources.

Inventions 2 and 3/4 are unrelated because the products of invention 2 are not used or otherwise involved in the methods of inventions 3 or 4.

Inventions 3-4 are each unrelated to one another. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together. Inventions 3-4 are each directed towards different methods that have different modes of operation, different functions, different starting materials, different effects, and/or different outcome measures.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or separate search requirement based on particular aspects of the inventions, e.g. invention 3 is drawn to preventing or treating viral diseases whereas invention 4 is drawn to treating tumors, it would impose a serious burden on the Examiner and USPTO resources to search the inventions together.

The Examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejections or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection is governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance is governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain

Art Unit: 1647

dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections under 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the

5 Examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Interferons.

A) Interferon- $\alpha$

10 B) Interferon- $\beta$

C) Interferon- $\omega$

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 12, and 25, for example, are generic.

15 Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

20 Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

5 showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct  
10 species of the claimed invention: route of administration.

D) Oral

E) Vein injection

F) Intramuscular

G) Intraperitoneal

15 H) Subcutaneous

I) Nasal

J) Mucosal

K) Inhalation by an inspirator

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for  
20 prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 25, for example, is generic.



Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless

5 accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the  
10 elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over  
15 the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention and a species from A-C to be examined even though  
20 the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Additionally, if Applicant elects invention 3 or 4 a species from D-K must be elected.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by  
5 a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **J. Jason Galvez, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is  
10 **571-272-2935**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday 9 AM to 5 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Brenda Brumback, Ph.D.** can be reached at **571-272-0887**.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**. Information regarding the status of an application may be  
15 obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,  
20 contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

JJG  
4/29/2005

*Bridget E. Bunner*  
patent examiner